



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,680	02/19/2004	Lars Kahlman	024944-195	2007
21839 7590 06/27/2007 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				
EXAMINER				
KRAUSE, JUSTIN MITCHELL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3682				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/27/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,680

Applicant(s)

KAHLMAN, LARS

Examiner

Justin Krause

Art Unit

3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "[T]he combination comprises properties" which is indefinite because it is unclear what property or properties, or even a type of property is being claimed. Additionally, claim 5 uses the term "it" to describe a part of the invention, it is unclear what "it" is, and the claims should be written in such a way to positively recite the features being claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyota (US Patent 6,450,692) in view of Hirano et al (JP 6-306383).

Toyota discloses a deep groove ball bearing (see figs 1 and 2, Col 2 Line 55-Col 3, line 9) bearing comprising martensitic stainless steel bearing rings (1,2) with a steel

cage (4) and is lubricated with a grease or oil, but does not disclose a viscosity of the lubricant.

Hirano teaches use of a bearing grease having a base oil of synthetic ester and further comprising soap of polyurea having a base oil viscosity of 10-245 cSt at 40 degrees Celcius to provide durability at high temperature and low oil separation, stop shearing and cause charring under shear to make leakage from the bearing difficult.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a grease as taught by Hirano in the bearing of Toyota, the motivation would have been to provide a grease that provides high temperature durability with low oil separation to stop shearing and cause charring under shear to make leakage from the bearing difficult.

The bearing made by the combination of Toyota and Hirano satisfies the intended use recited in the preamble of the claim.

Regarding claim 5, as best understood, the combination comprises properties enabling it to withstand an emergency temperature of 600 degrees Celcius for 60 minutes with a stand still of 2 minutes after 15 minutes to the emergency temperature. The bearing of Toyota may be made of 440C stainless steel. The properties of 440C stainless steel found on Matweb.com state that 440C stainless steel is capable of continuous operation up to 760 degrees Celcius and intermittent operation as high as 815 degrees Celcius.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 24, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the combination of Toyota and Hirano does not disclose the properties of a bearing that would satisfy the limitations of high temperature operation.

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "high temperature emergency operation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hira*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

The rejection discloses all of the positively claimed bearing structure of the device. It therefore must also anticipate the intended function of the device disclosed in the preamble.

The performance characteristics are given limited patentable weight, as they are considered functional limitations. The claim language fails to distinguish the structure of the bearing from the prior art, and do not set forth any specific properties that distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin Krause whose telephone number is 571-272-3012. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Ridley can be reached on 571-272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMK
JMK 6/18/07


Thomas R. Hannon
Primary Examiner